



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,695	09/25/2003	Wayne A. Jensen	DI-9-1	8741
26949	7590	02/16/2006	EXAMINER	
HESKA CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. 3760 ROCKY MOUNTAIN AVE LOVELAND, CO 80538			HUMPHREY, LOUISE WANG ZHIYING	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1648		

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/670,695	JENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Louise Humphrey, Ph.D.	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 40-81 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 40-81 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the preliminary amendment filed on 30 October 2003. Claims 1-39 have been canceled. Claims 40-81 have been newly added. Claims 40-81 are pending and restricted.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 40-75, drawn to a method to determine the immune status of an animal against an infectious agent, said method comprising the steps of: (a) contacting a biological specimen of said animal with a recombinant antigen capable of forming a complex with an antibody specific for said infectious agent under conditions suitable for formation of said complex, wherein said recombinant antigen is a protein from said infectious agent free of contaminants that result in false positives; and (b) detecting the presence or absence of said complex, wherein the presence or absence of said complex is indicative of the immune status of said animal, classified in class 435, subclass 7.92.
- II. Claim 76, drawn to a method to determine whether a human should be treated for rabies infection, said method comprising: obtaining a biological specimen from an animal suspected of having exposed the human to rabies virus infection; (b) contacting said biological specimen with a recombinant rabies virus protein capable of forming a complex with an

antibody specific for rabies virus under conditions suitable for formation of said complex; and (c) detecting the presence or absence of said complex, wherein the presence of said complex indicates the human should be treated for rabies infection., classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

III. Claims 77-81, drawn to a kit for determining the immune status of an animal, said kit comprising: (a) a recombinant infectious agent antigen that is specific for detecting an antibody selective for said infectious agent; and (b) a means to detect an antibody that selectively binds to said recombinant antigen, classified in class 435, subclass 810.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions III and (I and II) are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the claimed methods of detection can use materially different products such as aptamers.

Inventions I and II are unrelated because they are methods with different objective, antigens, and sources of immune response. Invention II has more steps. Therefore, each method is patentably distinct.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or recognized divergent subject matter, and require non-coextensive literature and sequence searches

even though in some cases the classification is shared, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Sequence Election

In addition to the above inventions, further restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. §121: one specific sequence with SEQ ID NO must be elected.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other, because of the following reasons:

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. §806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different sequences, restriction is deemed proper because these products constitute patentably distinct inventions. Each of the SEQ ID NO's is a unique and separately patentable sequence, requiring a unique search for the prior art. Searching all of the sequences in a single patent application would constitute an undue search burden on the examiner and the USPTO's resources because of the non-coextensive nature of these searches.

Further, Inventions of different SEQ ID NO's are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions represent

structurally different polypeptides and the polynucleotides encoding them. Therefore, where structural identity is required, such as for hybridization or expression, the different sequences have different effects.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Irrespective of which invention is elected, Applicants are further required to elect one species of recombinant antigen as exemplified by claims 55-64, 69, and 70.

These species are distinct because their amino acid sequences or encoding nucleotide sequences, structures, modes of action, etiologies and pathological conditions are different, thus each antigen represents a patentably distinct subject matter.

Should Applicants elect Invention I, Applicants are further required to elect one species of time period between vaccination and the collection of biological specimen for the immunological assay, as exemplified by claims 71-74.

Each time period constitutes a different method step, thus each species represents a patentably distinct subject matter.

Furthermore, the examination of specific species would require different searches in the scientific literature, which would not be coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search these species together.

Applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 40, 71, and 75-77 are generic.

Applicants are advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP §809.02(a).

Should applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance

Art Unit: 1648

with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Louise Humphrey, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Louise Humphrey
07 February 2006


JEFFREY STUCKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER